

Case 2604

Diectophyme Collet-Meygret, 1802 (Nematoda): proposed confirmation of spelling (CIOMS Case No. 7)

M. E. Tollitt

Formerly of The Secretariat, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Abstract. The purpose of this application is to confirm, at the request of the Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS), the spelling of a parasitic nematode worm name in the form *Diectophyme*. This is preferred to the alternative spelling *Diectophyma* as it maintains the integrity of the original orthography. There has been no clear cut preference for either name over the last 50 years.

1. Collet-Meygret (1802, p. 463) proposed '*diectophyme*' for a genus of parasitic worm from the kidney of a dog. In explaining the etymology Collet-Meygret remarked, 'j'ai adopté le mot *diectophyme*, composé de *di*, venant de *dis* (deux fois), *octo* (huit), *phyma* (tubercule) ...'. 'Voici quels sont les caractères du genre *diectophyme*'. As far as can be ascertained the genus remained without included species until Rudolphi (1808, p. 84), who included the single species *Strongylus gigas* Rudolphi, (1802 p. 115).

2. Unfortunately, due to differing interpretations of Collet-Meygret's etymological explanation, the form of the name has varied between *Diectophyma* and *Diectophyme*. It seems that Bosc (1803, p. 255) was the first author to use the spelling *Diectophyma*, while Lamouroux (1824, p. 515) argued that Collet-Meygret had used *Diectophyme* as a vernacular and proposed *Diectophyma* as the correct latin version.

3. The variable spelling of the generic name has also affected the family name which has been spelled both as DIOCTOPHYMIDAE, first proposed by Railliet (1915, p. 493), based on *Diectophyme* and as DIOCTOPHYMATIDAE, first proposed, it is believed, by Chitwood & Chitwood (1950, p. 25, although attributed to Railliet) and apparently based on *Diectophyma* (see Harwood *et al.*, 1941). If the current proposals are accepted the former spelling would be correct.

4. Usage of the various spellings, both for generic and family names, has varied over the years. A review of the *Zoological Record* over the last 25 years suggests that *Diectophyma* might have been preferred, although there were a number of exceptions. From 1981 *Diectophyme* was used almost exclusively. However, influential general works such as Soulsby (1982) give *Diectophyma*, whilst the definitive and widely used CIH key to vertebrate nematodes (Anderson & Bain, 1982) favours *Diectophyme*. In short, there is and never has been clear cut usage of either name be it generic or family. A decision on which spelling to use would clearly be in the interest of stability.

5. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

- (1) to confirm that the spelling of the generic name *Diectophyme* Collet-Meygret, 1802, is the correct original spelling;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the name *Diectophyme* Collet-Meygret, 1802 (gender: neuter), type species, by subsequent monotypy, *Strongylus gigas* Rudolphi, 1802;
- (3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the name *renales* Goeze, 1782, as published in the binomen *Ascaris renales* (valid name at the time of this application of the type species of *Diectophyme* Collet-Meygret, 1802);
- (4) to place on the Official List of Family Group Names in Zoology the name DIOCTOPHYMIDAE Railliet, 1915 (type genus *Diectophyme* Collet-Meygret, 1802);
- (5) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology the name *Diectophyma* Bosc, 1803 (an incorrect subsequent spelling of *Diectophyme* Collet-Meygret, 1802);
- (6) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family Group Names in Zoology the name DIOCTOPHYMATIDAE Railliet, 1915 (based on an incorrect subsequent spelling).

Acknowledgements

I am indebted to Dr Donald Heyneman, Dr Ralph Lichtenfels, Professor Roy C. Anderson and Dr L. B. Holthuis for their assistance in the preparation of this case.

References

- Anderson, R. C. & Bain, O. 1982. Key to genera of the superfamilies Rhabditoidea, Diectophymatoidea, Trichinelloidea and Muspicioidea. In Anderson, R. C., Chabaud, A. G. & Willmott, S. *CIH Keys to the Nematode Parasites of Vertebrates*. No. 9. 26 pp.
- Bosc, L. A. G. 1803. *Nouveau Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle* . . . , vol. 7, 575 pp. Paris.
- Chitwood, B. G. & Chitwood, M. B. 1950. *An introduction to nematology*, Section 1. Anatomy. xi + 115 pp.
- Collet-Meygret, G. F. H. 1802. Mémoire sur un ver trouvé dans le rein d'un chien. *Journal de Physique, de Chimie et d'Histoire naturelle*, **55**: 458–465.
- Goeze, J. A. E. 1782. *Versuch einer Naturgeschichte der Eingeweidewürmer thierischer Körper*. xi + 471 pp. Blankenburg.
- Harwood, P. D., Chitwood, B. G. & McIntosh, A. 1941. Report of the Committee on Nomenclature. The status of *Diectophyma*, *Diectophyme*, and *Eustrongylus*. *The Journal of Parasitology*, **27** (3): 280–282.
- Lamouroux, J. 1824. Diectophyme: Diectophyma. *Dictionnaire classique d'Histoire Naturelle*, vol. 5. 653 pp. Paris.
- Railliet, J. L. A. 1915. L'emploi des médicaments dans le traitement des maladies causées par des Nématodes. *Recueil de Médecine vétérinaire*, **41**, no. 15, 490–513.
- Rudolphi, C. A. 1802. Beschreibung von *Strongylus gigas*. *Beiträge zur Anatomie und Physiologie der Thiere*, **1**: 115–116.

- Rudolphi, C. A.** 1808. *Entozoorum sive Vermium intestinalium. Historia Naturalis*, vol. 1(1). xxii + 527 pp. Amsterdam.
- Soulsby, E. J. L.** 1982. *Helminths, Arthropods and Protozoa of Domesticated Animals* (7th ed.). xi + 809 pp. Baillière Tindall, London.